



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

Peter P. Scott
LSI Logic Corporation
1551 McCarthy Blvd
M/S AD-106
Milpitas, CA 95035

MAILED

JUN 12 2002

**DIRECTOR'S OFFICE
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600**

Paper No. 12

In re Application of Solomon	:
Application No. 09/082,663	: DECISION DISMISSING PETITION
Filed: May 21, 1998	: TO WITHDRAW HOLDING OF
Attorney Docket No. 97-125	: ABANDONMENT UNDER 37 CFR
Title: METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR	: §1.181(a)
EMULATING A DEVICE WITHIN A DATA	:
PROCESSING SYSTEM	:

This decision Vacates the previous petition decision mailed May 17, 2002. That decision inadvertently contained a conflicting concluding paragraph that has been removed and replaced. Otherwise, this petition decision maintains the same substance and reasons for the decision.

This is a decision on the petition filed on October 4, 2001 under 37 CFR §1.181 to withdraw the holding of abandonment of the above-identified application.

The application was held abandoned for failure to respond in a timely manner to the Office communication setting a period for reply that was mailed June 5, 2000. The October 2001 petition provides a statement by a representative for applicant; and a copy of docket records for application 09/082, 663. The basis for the petition is on the grounds the Office communication mailed June 2000 was not received.

According to the MPEP §711.03(c), the showing required to establish nonreceipt of an Office action includes the following:

- 1) a statement from practitioner that the Office action was not received,
- 2) a statement from practitioner that the file jacket and docket records were searched,
- 3) a copy of the docket record at the address of record, and
- 4) a reference to the docket record in the practitioner's statement.


A review of the evidence provided in the petition *may be* sufficient to prove nonreceipt of the Office action mailed June 5, 2000. Petitioners have provided all the necessary statements, but the accompanying docket record raises questions requiring further clarification from the practitioner. The practitioner states that a "copy of the *entire* docket record for the subject application showing *all* replies docketed, if any, ... is attached." However, the Notice of Abandonment mailed to the Milpitas address is not logged in even though it is identified through inter-office communications as

having been received on March 22, 2001. The evidence provided to date suggests possible lapses in coverage and confusion in-house. Therefore, the evidence is not sufficient to overcome the presumption of receipt, practitioner's statements to the contrary notwithstanding. The practitioner is requested to provide further clarification regarding the docketing of Office communications in regards to timeframes when persons with primary responsibilities may be absent from the company and in regards to the nature of the docket record provided. Specifically, why that record should be considered accurate when it omits the entry of other papers received.

The docket record also raises the issue of timeliness of the petition. Beginning with the February 6, 2001 entry, in-house and outside counsel appear to be on notice regarding the abandonment of the application. As of March 22, 2001, the Milpitas location appears to confirm receipt of the Notice of Abandonment. However, the petition to withdraw the holding of abandonment was not submitted until October 4, 2001. 37 CFR §1.181(f) provides that any petition not filed within 2 months from the action complained of may be dismissed as untimely. The petition was filed *seven* months from the mail date of the Notice of Abandonment and a terminal disclaimer did not accompany it. However, the requirement to file a terminal disclaimer to overcome this delay is being held in abeyance. The record suggests applicant's representatives intentionally delayed filing a petition since such a recommendation to do so was made as early as March 23, 2001. The intention of the petition process and of terminal disclaimers is not to permit applicants to escape their duty of reasonable diligence. (See, Denny Notice, "Diligence in Filing Petitions to Revive and Petitions to Withdraw the Holding of Abandonment," 1124 OG 23.)

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

If the petitioner desires further review of this decision, petitioner should file a Request for Reconsideration within two (2) months of the mailing date of this decision.



John Love, Director
Technology Center 3600

JAB